



Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections

954 W Jefferson Street P.O. Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0285 Phone: (208) 334-5100 Fax: (208) 334-5120

Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS) 1 800 377-3529

C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER
Governor

SHARON HARRIGFELD
Director

December 16, 2011

TO: Members of the Joint Finance-Appropriations Committee
FROM: Sharon Harrigfeld, Director
RE: Juvenile Justice Substance Use Disorder (SUD) Services Delivery System

Thank you for the opportunity to provide an update on the status of the new Juvenile Justice Substance Use Disorder Services Delivery System. Since receiving the appropriation, IDJC and our judicial and county partners have worked together to create a locally managed treatment system with enhanced accountability to provide community-based treatment services to justice-involved juveniles.

The following information should help to provide further clarity to the questions we have been asked to address in the hearing:

1) Based upon reporting done for FY 2012 (last legislative session) by the Interagency Committee on Substance Abuse and Treatment, how many individuals were being served and what type of services were they receiving compared to the population now being served?

To transition the system and allow local management, IDJC and county juvenile probation obtained a list of clients with billed services from the prior year to ensure treatment was not interrupted for these active clients. Of the list of 1,200 with billed services from February to May of the prior year, less than half of these clients were identified as having current engagement in treatment. An analysis of billed services in June 2010 shows less than 300 were actively involved in treatment at the end of the year. After five months with the new system in place, 398 juveniles are currently under probation supervision as ordered by the court with an integrated treatment component.

The following chart compares the number of clients served as of November 15th year to date for fiscal years 2011 with 2012. Though the numbers served are significantly higher this time last year, an analysis of the billing data shows only a portion of these clients were attending treatment sessions regularly.

<u>July through November 2010:</u> FY 2011	<u>July through November 2011:</u> FY 2012
<u>583</u> Outpatient / Intensive Outpatient	<u>342</u> Outpatient / Intensive Outpatient
<u>60</u> Residential	<u>40</u> Residential
* Source BPA billing data	* Source BPA billing data

During FY 2011, only those adjudicated juveniles court-ordered to SUD treatment under 20-520(i) were able to be served. Currently, county probation departments working with the court may authorize any justice involved youth into SUD treatment. By having juvenile probation officers central to case decision making, we expect to maintain the availability of services throughout the full year and to be able to expand services available in rural areas of the state.

GOAL: The goal of a treatment system integrated with probation is to identify clients in need of services, authorize appropriate services at times of need and manage consistent participation for those juveniles who can maximize the benefit of treatment: (1) by demonstrating a readiness for change; (2) by having SUD treatment integrated with services and supervision to address criminogenic risk; and (3) by engaging juveniles in treatment for appropriate lengths of time at the appropriate levels of intensity.

a) Provide specifics about the population you are serving.

Target Population: Youth involved in the justice system with identified substance use disorder treatment needs that can be met in the community.

Idaho's juvenile justice system is based on the balanced approach. Integrating treatment as ordered by the court with other conditions of probation creates the best opportunity for successful rehabilitation of the juvenile. Ensuring participation in treatment is a critical component of accountability for this population. The new locally managed juvenile justice SUD delivery system provides the opportunity to fully integrate treatment and supervision to better serve the justice-involved juveniles.

The partners each play a key role in the system:

- The courts have jurisdiction over the case and the juveniles probation period and an ability to hold the parents accountable;
- Probation oversees the juvenile per the court-ordered conditions;
- IDJC ensures accountability, monitors the expenditures and evaluates the results.

b) How much of your appropriation has been spent and on what activities as of the end of November 2011. If you want to include information about how much you have committed or obligated please do so separately.

JJ SUD Treatment	Expenditures FY 2012 YTD	Juveniles Served FY 2012 YTD
OP	\$114,384	254
IOP	\$68,118	112
Residential	\$326,676	40
RSS / Other	\$39,112	186
Admin / DCS	\$60,992	---
Total	\$609,282	420

c) How do you plan to manage for the remainder of the fiscal year?

Almost six months into the fiscal year using a new client identification and authorization process maximizing the strengths of juvenile probation to support SUD treatment, we have not yet reached our goal of reaching a high percentage of the target population. The largest reduction in expenditures has been in residential placements for SUD treatment. IDJC has monitored this development closely. It is apparent that counties and district teams have more often determined that residential care was not justified due to issues of an absence of readiness for change and lack of family support for change. Throughout the juvenile justice system the standard has been mutually set that every effort will be made to serve juveniles in the community (not in residential care or by IDJC commitment). This standard is operating with respect to juvenile justice SUD treatment as well, helping to assure that treatment dollars spent for more expensive residential care are committed to juveniles with the best chance to benefit from that level of care.

The efforts of the system for the remainder of the fiscal year will be:

- 1) to continue to train and prepare juvenile probation officers to trust that the SUD services they access to be available throughout the year and to increase efforts to identify clients in need of services. Their previous experience has led them to believe that services will be denied.
- 2) to focus on further development of treatment resources in rural areas of the state and to utilize a portion of the unused treatment funds set aside to offset part of the cost of residential treatment, where that level can be justified.
- 3) to recognize and engage the family as a valued partner in the treatment plan.
- 4) to place greater emphasis on making SUD treatment services available to younger juveniles and those not yet on formal probation. Having established in the first five months of operation that funding is available to support this expansion, we will be better able to serve juveniles earlier in their substance abusing histories, where research suggests results achieved are better.

d) These funds were distributed in the appropriation process using estimates. Please use your best judgment as to whether the funding level is sufficient based upon previously authorized services or whether your agency is expanding or contracting services and for what reasons.

The appropriation for this population was based on actual expenditures in FY 2010. Last year expenditures totaled \$3.5 million dollars. If the utilization rate for the first five months of the year was maintained, this would not require use of the full appropriation. However, IDJC and their partners see this next year as an opportunity to strengthen the service delivery system to meet the actual need of this population.

Estimate of Need: Based upon a one day count there are just over **5,500** juveniles on probation statewide. This does not include juveniles on informal probation or diversion. About **30 % (approximately 1500)** of juveniles on probation have been identified as having some level of substance abuse need.

By enhancing identification and screening tools, expanding services in rural areas, engaging families and retaining juveniles in treatment, the depth of this need will be reached for the first time. Those plans along with the increasing experience and confidence in the new system would be expected to increase utilization rates for the remainder of the year.

e) Is decentralization improving or hindering coordination and cooperation between stakeholders?

Decentralization has paid huge dividends in terms of involving essential court and county stakeholders in serving justice involved youth with SUD treatment needs. The previous system largely excluded them and thus increased frustration with the operation of SUD services for this group of juveniles. Ultimately SUD services for these juveniles is strengthened by integrating SUD treatment with the full range of services for juveniles in the justice system.

Partnership with the courts and with the other state agencies involved has also been enhanced by providing each of those entities with a direct stake or investment in building a more successful system.

2) What responsibilities or activities, if any, is your agency now performing that were previously delivered by private providers?

In developing our partnership with county juvenile probation, the Department and the counties developed a set of Guidelines for our operations. Those guidelines (available on the IDJC Public Web Site) include commitments to use only duly qualified and certified treatment providers and a commitment to use BPA network providers unless the county / district could demonstrate that no BPA provider was available or that a reasonable alternative existed that would meet professional IDHW qualifications and offer better efficiency.

There have been very few exceptions to use of BPA network providers. In some cases GAIN assessments have been provided by public (county) employees who hold the necessary training and credentials. In all cases these options have been exercised as a part of the district SUD plan submitted and agreed to by IDJC.

3) What responsibilities or activities, if any, is your agency now performing or you are paying another entity to perform, that were not being done before the change in funding?

Prior to the change in funding for SUD services for justice involved youth, IDJC had no infrastructure or commitment of staff time dedicated to the operation of that system. The target population is outside of any direct statutory authority of the department provided in the Juvenile Corrections Act.

With the change in funding IDJC sought establishment of a program manager position to oversee the department's role in managing the appropriation, which includes enforcing consistent application of the guidelines established and on planning for system development

based on reporting on clients served and funds utilized. Without an infrastructure to implement the program IDJC relied upon its strong partnership with county juvenile probation and the courts to design and implement a service delivery system. The structure of partnership with the counties and courts is fundamental to the intent of the JCA and was the most reasonable option for a management structure that had to be in place within three months of the notice of the appropriation change.

The appropriation was allocated to each county based upon youth population with a requirement in the established guidelines that counties work together within their judicial districts to build a common plan for use of the funds. No funds are transferred to the district teams but rather the “spending authority” to use the amounts allocated. Three of the seven districts have chosen to pay for a manager to oversee their respective juvenile justice SUD programs. A 10% maximum was set within the guidelines to limit the funds spent on administration. Expenditures to date assure that the 10% limit will not be exceeded. At the state level, IDJC also withheld administrative funds. Five percent was held for the cost of a formal evaluation and for the cost of the needed staff resources.

a) Why did you take over the activity?

In order to enhance accountability and manage the system at the local level, it was important to add essential internal controls.

b) What is the advantage to the state for you to take over the activity?

The state will benefit from a more effective and accountable treatment system with evaluation results to guide further investment and decision making.

c) Does this change save the state money or cost more?

The allocations made and discussed above were necessary for the effective implementation of a system that builds on the strength of partnerships with counties and courts. The costs of a formal evaluation and for a regional structure may reflect increases but are in fact necessary to provide the public accountability necessary to determine if and how the new service delivery system in SUD treatment for juvenile justice is an improvement. These apparent additional costs have been offset by reducing the charges for which BPA is able to bill the juvenile justice SUD system for administrative functions such as chart reviews and continued stay reviews. These functions have been assumed for the most part by the counties and district teams. IDJC is committed to maximizing treatment dollars and reducing the administrative burden as compared to prior years.

d) What organizational changes has your department made to deliver these services?

The department has established one program manager position within the Community Operations and Program Services division to oversee SUDS. The department has had to commit significant staff time from other positions to help design and establish the new system and this effort will have to continue.

IDJC, courts and county partners are dedicated to developing a substance use disorder system for juveniles that reaches those in need of treatment and engages families when possible. We look forward to reporting full results in the coming months.